REMARKS

In the Office Action[1], the Examiner objected to the specification; objected to

claims 12 and 19; and rejected claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being

anticipated by the Template Software product line ("*SNAP*").

Applicants have amended the specification and claims 1-6, 8, 10-12, and 19, and

canceled claims 7 and 9 without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-6, 8, and 10-21

remain pending.

The Examiner objected to the specification "because it contains an embedded

hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code" (Office Action at page 2).

Applicants have amended paragraph 40 and paragraph 72 of the specification to

remove embedded hyperlinks from the specification. Accordingly, Applicants

respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

Applicants have amended claims 12 and 19 to correct informalities objected to by

the Examiner (Office Action at page 2). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request

withdrawal of the objection to claims 12 and 19.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C.

§ 102(b) as being anticipated by the *SNAP* and note that the rejection of cancelled

claims 7 and 9 is now moot. In order to properly establish that *SNAP* anticipates

Applicants' claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102, each and every element of each of

the claims in issue must be found, either expressly described or under principles of

inherency, in that single reference. Furthermore, "[t]he identical invention must be

---

[1] The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim." *See* M.P.E.P. § 2131,

quoting *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1126, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913,

1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Claim 1, as amended, recites a method for developing an application, including,

for example, "employing an API derived from the data model to access the development

objects, wherein employing the API further comprises using tools that use the API to

enable a user to . . refactor a copied one of the development objects to modify a key

attribute of the copied one of the development objects." *SNAP* does not disclose at

least these elements of claim 1.

The Examiner alleges that the Workflow Template Training Course for *SNAP*

("*TRAINW*"), Section A, page 3, teaches "enabling a user to refactor a copied

development object" (Office Action at page 5). However, this is not correct. *TRAINW*

discloses SNAP components to "[e]nable[ ] implementation of monitors and controls for

multi process applications" (Section A, page 3). *TRAINW* also discloses process

templates for "[p]rovid[ing] integrated life-cycle business process modeling tool

designed to create enterprise-wide production workflow systems" (Section A, page 3).

Finally, *TRAINW* discloses an illustration of a pyramid, where the cross sections in order

from the base to the top of the pyramid are labeled as follows:

"Foundation . . . SNAP . . . Optional Components," "Process . . . Templates," "Business

[Templates]," and "Customized Code." However, *TRAINW* fails to disclose "using tools

that use the API to enable a user to . . refactor a copied one of the development

objects to enable to modify a key attribute of the copied one of the development objects

while updating existing references," as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, for at least the reason stated above, *SNAP* cannot anticipate claim 1. Independent claims 12 and 19, while of different scope, recite elements similar to those of claim 1, and are thus allowable over *SNAP* for at least the same reason as claim 1. Claims 2-6, 8, 10, 11, 13-18, 20 and 21 depend from claims 1, 12, and 19, and are thus allowable over *SNAP* for at for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: December 17, 2007   By:_____
                                        Eli Mazour
                                        Reg. No. 59,318